

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 11, 32 and 34 have been amended. No new matter has been entered. Therefore, claims 1-34 are pending and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENTS:**

Applicants note that support for the amendments of claims 1, 11, 32 and 34 may be found, for example, in FIGs. 2 and 3 which clearly illustrate that the inner member is suspended from an upper edge of the main body and has one or more openings, which are formed in the area that faces the nozzle and which are bordered on outsides thereof by an inner wall of the main body.

**ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:**

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response because it is believed that the amendment of claims 1, 11, 32 and 34 places this application into condition for allowance and because the amendments should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised.

**INFORMAL TELEPHONE CONFERENCE OF OCTOBER 25:**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the informal telephone conference held between the Examiner and the applicants on October 25, 2005. Although no formal agreement was reached as to the allowability of the claims, it was informally agreed that amendments to the claims were necessary to overcome the rejections discussed below. Accordingly, applicants have so amended the claims, as noted above.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103:**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9-12, 18-20, 22-25 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Shen (U.S. Patent 2,793,609). Claims 3, 5, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 20, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen taken in view of Spahn (U.S. Patent 6,237,529).

Claims 4, 5, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen taken in view of Witzman (U.S. Patent 6,202,591). Claims 5, 6, 15, 20 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen taken in view of Adams (U.S. Patent 3,466,424) or German DT 2612424. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen taken in view of Tiedje (U.S. Patent 5,944,903) or Tanabe (U.S. 2001/0008121). Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-20, 22-25 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Spahn. Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Spahn in view of Witzman. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Spahn in view of Van Slyke. Claims 1-7, 9-16, 22-26 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Witzman. Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Witzman. Claims 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Witzman in view of Tiedje. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Witzman in view of Spahn.

Regarding the rejections of claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 now recites an inner member suspended from an upper edge of the main body that has one or more openings, which are formed in the area that faces the nozzle and which are bordered on outsides thereof by an inner wall of the main body.

Applicants respectfully assert that none of the cited references disclose, teach, or suggest these features. For example, Shen does not teach that the bar, which appears to correspond to the claimed inner member, is suspended from an upper edge of the main body. Furthermore, both Shen and Spahn teach openings that surround the bar and the plate 30, respectively, as opposed to openings that are "formed in the area that faces the nozzle and which are bordered on outsides thereof by an inner wall of the main body," as claimed in claim 1. Thus, neither reference discloses the features of the claimed invention. In addition, it is noted that none of the additionally cited references provide or are cited as providing the features not included in either Shen or Spahn.

Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is patentably distinguished from the references and that the rejections of claim 1 are overcome.

Regarding the rejections of claim 11, 32 and 34, it is noted that these claims recite substantially similar subject matter as claim 1 and that, therefore, the rejections of these claims are also overcome.

Regarding the rejections of the remaining dependent claims, it is noted that these claims are allowable due at least upon their dependence on claims 1, 11, 32 and 34, which are allowable, as discussed above.

**CONCLUSION:**

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 50-3333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*12/14/05*

By: \_\_\_\_\_

*[Signature]*

Howard I. Levy  
Registration No. 55,378

1400 Eye St., N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510